



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the latter days for a testimony for ever," where, it is to be observed, the reason of the injunction is also given—namely, that the words which the prophet delivered might be preserved for future generations. Accordingly, we know nothing—and the fact is a remarkable one, considering the partiality of the later Jews for oral tradition—of the teaching of any of the prophets, save only what is handed down to us by *written* tradition—viz., the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

If, then, it pleased God to permit a trial to be made, under the most favourable possible circumstances, of the adequacy of oral tradition as a means of securely handing down His revelations; if, upon the total failure of this experiment, He himself introduced, and expressly commanded the continuance of a new and more perfect mode of conveyance; is it reasonable to suppose that in the last, the most perfect, and the only universal revelation of His will, designed for all times and all nations, He would sanction even a partial return to the defective and precarious mode of transmission, which, by His own express injunctions, had been for many centuries discontinued? The bare statement of such a supposition is sufficient to show its utter improbability.

But we are here met by the assertion\* that the objections to Tradition, based upon the inherent uncertainty of oral communication, and the unavoidable disturbing influences to which it is exposed, do not apply to the tradition for which Roman Catholics contend. They hold, it is said, that the unwritten word was committed not to any particular fallible individuals, but to the bishops and the whole body of the Catholic Church, to which Christ himself imparted the character of infallibility and indefectibility. In other words, the channel, through which the divine and apostolical traditions are transmitted, is secured by the great Head of the Church from every possible danger. The statements of the 20th Article of the Church of England, respecting the authority and office of the Church, are also sometimes brought against Protestants to prove that they virtually admit the Catholic Church to possess the power here claimed for her.

Our limits preclude us at present from doing more than noticing the above so-called unassailable bulwark of Tradition; but we hope, in our next number, to return to the subject, and to complete our proof that the Church of England is justified in asserting, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: to that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite as necessary to salvation."

#### IS THE CHURCH OF ROME JUSTIFIED IN WITHHOLDING THE EUCHARISTIC CUP FROM THE LAITY?

THIS is a grave question, and one in which laymen, for whom we write, have a deep interest. If receiving the holy Eucharist be the most solemn duty of the Christian religion, enjoined upon all his faithful disciples by the Saviour himself, the receiving it *aright* must be a matter of the utmost moment; and an avoidable error in it can be little short of *sacrilege*. In expressing this opinion we are doing no more than eminent popes have themselves done, and are almost using their very language.

Pope Gelasius I., who did not die till A.D. 496, expressly says, that to minister the communion in one kind is open sacrilege—"We have found that some, having received only the portion wherein is the holy body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood; who, without doubt (forasmuch as I know not with what superstition they are taught), should receive the *whole sacrament, or be kept from the whole*; because the *division* of one and the same mystery cannot come without *great sacrilege*."†

And Pope Leo the Great (to whom we have already referred on another important subject) in treating of the Manicheans, writes thus:—"They withdraw themselves from the sacrament of our salvation. With unworthy mouth they receive Christ's body; but they altogether refuse to *drink the blood of our redemption*, which things we would advertise you of, that both such men may be manifested by these tokens unto you, and also that they, being brought to light, may be *thrust out of the church* by sacerdotal authority."‡

This denunciation of two eminent popes will, no doubt, startle many of our readers, who are, doubtless, under the conviction that the practice of reserving the sacramental cup for the clergy alone is as ancient as the earliest traditions of the Church, and based upon the divine authority of either our Blessed Lord himself, or, at least, of his immediate Apostles. Is it not as-

serted by the Church of Rome that all the doctrines and usages of the church are derived either from the written Word of God, or traditions derived from the earliest age of Christianity? Do not most Roman Catholic laymen believe that they are so? Whether they are, in this instance, so derived and so supported, is the question we wish to inquire into, and get at the real truth about. We believe we may, without fear of contradiction, commence by stating, that all parties agree that our Blessed Lord instituted the Eucharist under two kinds. St. Matt. xxvi. 26—"And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said: take ye and eat; this is my body. And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." It would appear that our Lord laid greater emphasis on the participation of the cup, by enjoining them *all* to drink of it, than on that of the bread, which he distributed, not with a general injunction, such as "take ye *all* and eat," but with this simple precept, "take, eat;" and as St. Matthew reports him to have said, "drink ye *ALL* of this, so St. Mark (xiv. 23) relates that "they *all* drank of it," which shows the strict observance of the command, and the importance attached to it in the minds of the holy Apostles, who, it must be recollected, were indisputably under the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit himself; who, if errors or abuses were to arise in his Church in after ages, doubtless, in his infinite wisdom, foresaw them, and was thus particular, with a view to their prevention. We venture to assert, that there is not a single passage in the Holy Scriptures which affords any safe ground for a contrary practice, for we consider it by no means clear that the *breaking of bread*, spoken of in such passages as Luke xxiv. 30, Acts ii. 42, Acts xx. 7, at all refers to the Eucharist, any more than Mark vi. 41, Matt. xiv. 19, Mark viii. 6, when our Lord blessed and brake the loaves and gave them to his disciples long before the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To *break bread* was a phrase familiar to the Jews, and implied a distribution of it, meaning no more than sitting at meat with them; and such passages, therefore, afford no argument for withholding the sacramental cup from all but the clergy.

We are nearly as confident that there is nothing in the early Fathers to countenance what Pope Leo and Pope Gelasius so expressly and strongly condemned; but, on the contrary, we mean to show, that in the primitive ages of Christianity, the laity were in the habit of complying with our Lord's injunction, by receiving the Eucharist in both kinds.

St. Jerome tells of the "body of our Lord being carried in a basket, and the blood in a glass vessel, to relieve the poor."§ St. Basil says, "that it is good and profitable to partake every day of the blessed body and blood of Christ."¶ And where he treats of the peculiar virtues of Christians, he asks—"What is proper to him who eats the bread, and drinks the cup of Christ?"

St. Chrysostom draws no distinction between the priest and the laity; but compares all Christians in general with the Israelites—"As thou eatest the body of Christ, so did they manna: as thou *drinkest* the blood of Christ, so did they water out of the rock."‡ Again—"It is not now as under the Jewish law, when the priest partook of several things from the altar which the people did not: *there is no difference between the priest and the people* when we come to receive the holy mysteries, for one body and one cup is offered to *all*."§

It would be easy to multiply testimony on this point from the Fathers, but it appears to be needless, and we prefer proceeding at once to show the true origin of the modern practice of the Church of Rome, and the date of its final ratification, which did not take place till the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414. The doctrine of communion in one kind had, about two centuries before, begun to be agitated by the clergy; and towards the middle of the 13th century, St. Thomas Aquinas, so distinguished for scholastic subtleties, reduced it to a tangible shape, and first proposed the question, as a *subject of disputation*—viz., whether it was allowable to take the body of Christ *without* the blood, as it was customary with many churches to do so—at the same time admitting that, according to the custom of the *ancient church*, all persons, as they partook of the body, so they also partook of the blood.¶

Cardinal Bona admits that, from the origin of the Church to the 12th age, Christians, at all times and in every place, communicated under the species of bread and wine.¶ And Cardinal Bellarmine (De Euch. lib. iv. c. 4) virtually admits the same thing, when alleging the *excuse* for the change—viz., "that the inconvenience became more and more apparent as the

multitude of communicants increased, and so the custom under both species gradually ceased."

The nature of the inconveniences, and also the justification pleaded by the Church of Rome for sanctioning, at the Councils of Constance and Trent, what Pope Leo the Great and Pope Gelasius considered *sacrilege*, and deserving of *excommunication*, are both deserving of observation. The former we think futile in the extreme, indeed so trifling, that nothing but a dark and superstitious age could have considered them grave enough to justify a departure from primitive usage, based upon the express commands of our Lord himself. Will our readers believe that, among the *inconveniences* referred to, as justifying the change, were the following? To avoid the risk of spilling the wine, and the indecency which arose of communicants dipping their beards into it; lest the wine kept for the sick should turn sour; or some persons should not be able to bear its smell and taste, and the like!

We might well smile at such trifling excuses for departing from the established usage of many centuries, did we not think, with Pope Gelasius, that to depart from an express command of our Divine Master, touching the most solemn ordinance of his holy religion, and to establish a new practice at variance with it, is too like open rebellion against Christ to be treated lightly, even though the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414, ventured to oppose its authority to that of the Divine Founder of the institution. Did the Council of Constance deny that our Lord so instituted it? So far from it, the decree of that council sets out with acknowledging "that Christ instituted and administered this blessed sacrament to his disciples in both kinds, of bread and wine . . . and admitting, that in the primitive Church the faithful received it in *both* kinds;" and yet goes on to sanction by its authority the very reverse. To show that we are not misrepresenting the decree of the Council of Constance, we think it right to subjoin, in a note, an accurate copy of it in the original Latin, of which the following is a translation:—

"Whereas in some parts of the world there are some who presume rashly to assert that Christian people ought to take the sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of bread and wine, and that the laity should communicate not only under the species of bread, but also under the species of wine; also that they should receive it after supper, or at least not fasting, &c., &c.: hence it is, that this present sacred general council, lawfully congregated, in the Holy Spirit, at Constance, taking care to provide for the safety of the faithful against this error, after mature deliberation of those learned in both divine and human law, declares, decrees, and defines that, although Christ did institute this venerable sacrament after supper, and administered it to his disciples under each species of bread and wine, nevertheless, notwithstanding this (*hoc non obstante*) the laudable authority of the sacred canons and the approved custom of the Church, has held, and does hold, that this sacrament should not be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, unless in case of infirmity, or other necessity, by law or the Church conceded and admitted. And as this custom was reasonably introduced to avoid some dangers and scandals, although, in the primitive church, this sacrament was received by the faithful under each species, henceforth let it be received by those consecrating it under each species, but by the *laity* only under the species of bread, &c. Whence, since a custom of this sort was reasonably introduced by the Church and holy Fathers, and has been very long observed, let it be taken for law, which it is not lawful to disapprove, or to change at pleasure, without the authority of the Church. Wherefore to say that to observe this custom or law is sacrilegious, or unlawful, ought to be deemed erroneous, and those pertinaciously asserting the contrary of the foregoing, ought to be *repelled as heretics*, and *severely punished* by the diocesan of the place, or their officials, or the inquisitors of heretical depravity, in the kingdoms or provinces in which anything shall happen to be attempted or presumed against this decree, according to the canonical and lawful sanctions wholesomely framed in favour of the Catholic faith, and against heretics and their adherents."

\* Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus, quidam temerarie asserere præsumant, populum Christianum debere sumere Eucharistiam sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini, populum laicum passim communicant, etiam post cenam vel alias non jejunium, &c., &c. hinc est, quod hoc presens concilium sacrum generale Constanti, in spiritu sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem salutis fidei providere satagens, maturam plurimum doctorum, tam divini quam humani juris, deliberatione præhabita, declarat, decrevit, et diffinit, quod licet Christus post cenam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit, sub utraque specie panis et vini, hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo ecclesie servavit et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet conferri post cenam neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis, alterius necessitatis, ajuve vel ecclesie concessio vel admissio. Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum recipere a fidelibus sub utraque specie, potest a conscientibus sub utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis, suscipiatur, &c. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesie auctoritate pro libito mutare. Quapropter dicere, quod hæc consuetudinem aut legem observare, sit sacrilegium aut illicitum, censeri debet erroneum: et pertinaciter asserentes oppositum præmissorum

\* See Perrone, Loc. Theol. pars ii. sec. 2. cap. i.

† Comperimus autem quod quidam, sumpta tantum modo corporis acri portione, a calice sacri erroris abstinere. Qui proculdubio, quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arcantur: quia divinus unus, ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.—Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1661. Decret. Grat. Tert. Pars. de Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 12. Col. 1168.

‡ Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis humanæ. Ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt: sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines his manifestantur indicis, et notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur.—Leon, Mag. Op. Lut. 1623. Col. 108. Serm. iv. de quadrag.

§ Qui Corpus Domini, canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in citro.—Epist. ad Rust. Monach. Hieron. op. t. p. xcv. Tom. iv. Pars. ii. Col. 777. Basil.

¶ St. Chrysostom, op. vol. iii. p. 267, Par. 1839, vol. ii. p. 445.

‡ St. Chrysostom, op. Hom. xxiii. in 1 Cor. vol. p. 203, Par. 1732.

§ St. Chrysostom, op. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. lib. p. 568.

¶ Secundum antiquæ ecclesiæ consuetudinem omnes sicut communicant corpore, ita et communicant sanguine. Thos. Aquin. pars 3. Qu. 80. Art. 12.

¶ Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ab æculo duodecimo, sub specie panis et vini communicaverunt.—Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. 18.

We may have, hereafter, to notice the wars in Bohemia and elsewhere, which followed upon this memorable decree; by which the Church, by its own authority, ventured to abrogate and make void an express command of our Blessed Lord and the acknowledged practice of the primitive Church, on no stronger grounds than a custom introduced by reason, to avoid some dangers and scandals which they did not venture to define, though its framers clearly foresaw the opposition which would be made to such a decree, even in that dark age, and by men who did not deny transubstantiation; and, therefore, invoked the whole powers of the Church and Inquisition to punish as *heresy* any attempt to disobey it. We shall also show how vain were their daring and tyrannical attempts (even when subsequently ratified by the anathemas of the Council of Trent) to compel the whole of Christendom to substitute a custom of the Church in place of a command of its Heavenly Founder, given nearly 1,500 years before—depriving the laity of a sacred right, in order to increase the dignity of the priesthood. Probably, as there is no one point in which the Church of Rome has acted more visibly contrary to the Gospel than in this, so, we think, there is not any one thing which has raised a greater opposition to her, or made more men forsake her communion than this memorable and daring decree. The subject is one of deep interest to every follower of Christ, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and more especially to *laymen*, for whom we write, and whose privileges are deeply involved in the controversy. At present, until some graver reasons can be shown for varying from an express command of our Divine Master and the acknowledged practice of the primitive Church, than those above referred to, we shall only ask, whether it was those who disobeyed the Council of Constance, or the Council of Constance itself, who were really guilty of sacrilege, according to the solemnly-expressed judgments of Popes Gelasius and Leo the Great, to which we have already referred our readers?

#### TO WHOM SHOULD WE PRAY?

THERE is nothing so wonderful but that we cease to be astonished at it, if it is a thing which we do, or see done, every day. When first the electric telegraph or the daguerreotype was talked of, it sounded like a jest to hear of messages being sent hundreds of miles in a few seconds, or of pictures being painted by the sun; and yet, now thousands employ these wonderful inventions as a matter of course, and no doubt in a few years it will almost cease to be a subject of occasional remark how wonderful these inventions are. The very cattle who pasture by a line of railway, and who, at first, are frightened to distraction at the noise of the passing trains, gradually become so accustomed to it that they scarcely lift their heads from grazing when a train rushes by.

Now, of all the wonderful things which we daily see taking place, without wondering at them, there is, perhaps, none which, when we think of it, contains more to astonish us than *prayer*. When a man is suffering under any distress which neither he nor other men are able to relieve, nothing is more natural or more common than to offer up a prayer to Almighty God for the removal of the affliction. The same man, perhaps, would be too shy to ask a small favour of another man of rank a little higher than his own, or, if he required a favour from one very much his superior, could not venture to speak until he had obtained an introduction from some one likely to have influence with him. And yet, a moment's thought must show how infinitely above him is He whom he addresses so naturally, and often so thoughtlessly. Each of us is but one among millions of inhabitants of the earth; this earth itself but one among millions of worlds, each probably as densely peopled as our own; is it not wonderful, then, that creatures so insignificant as we are should have boldness to address the maker and governor of all things? But the wonder is increased when we remember that we are *sinful* creatures, and that we who are so ready to ask God for favours, have no right to expect anything at his hands save the penalties due to his offended justice. If, notwithstanding all this, our nature tells us that God has made prayer our instinct and our necessity, we must ask, has he not provided some means to calm that awe and dread which would deter us from approaching him? has he not, perhaps, appointed some being to mediate between us and him, some being not too highly exalted above our nature, but one who we may be confident can sympathize in our sufferings and our frailties?

Now, the Church of England and the Church of Rome are agreed on this, that God *has* provided such a mediator as we are speaking of; and that in the person of his own Son. He is both God and man, and is thereby peculiarly suited to be the object of our devotions. As God, he has infinite power to assist all his suppliants; as man, he has given proofs of love to us and of readiness

to sympathize with us, sufficient to give us confidence in his willingness to help us. And his willingness to help us is not matter of conjecture or of inference; he has *promised* that the petitions shall be granted which are presented to the Father in his name.

But though, on this point of doctrine, the two churches are agreed, there is a great difference as to the manner in which it is practically received by the members of both communions. We have, in our previous numbers, spoken of the importance that each Christian who is able should study for himself the written Word of God. Any who neglects to do this, even though he may be rightly informed as to the doctrines contained in Scripture, runs the risk of not having them impressed on his mind in the same relative importance which they hold in the Bible. For example, we believe that the doctrine that our Blessed Lord was perfect man, although a doctrine which no Christian will formally deny, is one which forms no part of the *practical* creed of those Roman Catholics who are not familiar with the Bible. It is as God that such a one almost exclusively regards our Saviour; as the future judge of mankind, who shall hereafter appear, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on those who know not God. It is no wonder, then, that, from dwelling exclusively on this awful side of our Lord's character, they should well nigh cease to look on him as the mediator through whom we are to draw nigh to the Father, and that they should seek for other mediators, through whom we may approach to him. Another circumstance which contributes to produce the same effect is the fact, that the ordinary pictorial representations of our Lord relate, for the most part only, to the two extreme points of his sojourn on earth. He is commonly pictured either as an infant in his mother's arms, or as in the agonies of death on the cross; and as neither of these representations bring him before the mind as one ready to hear and answer the requests of his people, those who have not some other means of studying his character are in danger of losing sight of some of the most important practical lessons taught us by our Saviour's incarnation.

But very different is the case of those whose knowledge of our Lord's nature is derived from the Gospel narratives, and who, consequently, have read not merely of the beginning and the end, but of *all* his life; who know that he is represented by the evangelists as perfect man, taking part in all in which man may without sin engage; censured by the self-righteous of his day for the readiness with which he would enter any scene of innocent festivity; yet still more ready to enter as a comforter and help into the house of sickness or of mourning; and as he called himself, the friend of his disciples, their teacher, their counsellor, their intercessor. It is perfectly impossible for any one who has thus studied the character of Jesus Christ when he was on earth, and who believe that he is the same now, to suppose that he will consider the distresses of his suppliants beneath his attention, or to imagine that they can find other intercessors more compassionate, or more patient, or more forgiving. It is remarkable that it is recorded on several occasions, in the Gospels, that our Lord heard the petitions which those about him would have had him spurn, and dealt mercifully with the sins which his disciples would have had him punish. For example:—Luke xviii. 35—43. Mark x. 13—14. Luke ix. 51—56. Matt. xv. 21—28, which we give verbatim from the Douay Bible.

“*Luke xviii. 35 to 43.*

“Now it came to pass, when he drew nigh to Jericho, that a certain blind man sat by the wayside begging:

“And when he heard the multitude passing by, he asked what this meant.

“And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by.

“And he cried out, saying: Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me.

“And they that went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out much more: Son of David, have mercy on me.

“And Jesus standing, commanded him to be brought unto him; and when he was come near, he asked him,

“Saying: What wilt thou that I do to thee? But he said: Lord, that I may see.

“And Jesus said to him: Receive thy sight; thy faith hath made thee whole.

“And immediately he saw, and followed him, glorifying God. And all the people, when they saw it, gave praise to God.”

“*Mark x. 13, 14.*

“And they brought to him young children, that he might touch them. And the disciples rebuked them that brought them.

“Whom when Jesus saw, he was much displeased, and saith to them: Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.”

“*Luke ix. 51 to 56.*

“And it came to pass, when the days of his assumption were accomplishing, that he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem,

“And he sent messengers before his face; and going,

they entered into a city of the Samaritans, to prepare for him.

“And they received him not; because his face was of one going to Jerusalem.

“And when his disciples, James and John, had seen this, they said: Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?

“And turning, he rebuked them, saying: You know not of what spirit you are.

“The Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save. And they went into another town.”

“*Matt. xv. 21 to 28.*

“And Jesus went from thence, and retired into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.

“And, behold, a woman of Canaan, who came out of those coasts, crying out, said to him: Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David: my daughter is grievously troubled by a devil.

“Who answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying: Send her away, for she crieth after us;

“And he answering, said: I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel.

“But she came and adored him, saying: Lord, help me.

“Who answering, said: It is not good to take the bread of the children and cast it to the dogs.

“But she said: Yea, Lord; for the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from the table of their masters.

“Then Jesus answering, said to her: O woman, great is thy faith; be it done to thee as thou wilt; and her daughter was cured from that hour.”

We have added the last passage because it is the only one in the Gospels where the disciples appear to have been more ready to do a work of mercy than their Lord; and yet, when we examine the history, we find that the disciples' intercession proceeded, not from compassion, but from selfish impatience, to be rid of the woman's importunities, while our Lord's first refusal proceeded not from want of compassion but from a desire to draw her forth to fuller exercises of faith, which he was about richly to reward.

The case, then, stands thus:—It is true that, weak and sinful as we are, we might naturally find it difficult to come with any confidence to present requests to our justly offended God; but it is also true that God has, in his mercy, anticipated the difficulties which it was natural for us to experience, and has presented to us the human nature of Christ as a tangible object for our affections to take hold of, and through which we might be brought near to God. It is certain that God has made him known to us as our intercessor, as perfectly able to hear every request made to him, able also to grant it, and full of love and willingness to help all who seek his aid, as having also *promised* to grant requests made in his name. Now, if all this be true, can anything be more perverse than, notwithstanding all, to fly to other mediators, to whose intercession no promise has been given, with regard to whom we have no certainty (nothing beyond doubtful conjecture) whether they can know that we are addressing them at all, and no certainty that, if they do hear, they are able to procure the fulfilment of our requests; and who, we may also be sure, are infinitely inferior in love and compassion towards us to him who gave his life for our sakes? And it must be remembered, that recourse to such other mediators is admitted on all hands not to be divinely appointed. The Church of Rome herself only asserts that it is *permitted* us (not commanded) to seek the intercession of the saints; and the Roman Catholic who shall resolve from this day forth to offer prayers to none but God, would violate no precept of his church. It would surely, then, seem to be the safest way to direct all our prayers to him to whom we are commanded to pray, and who has promised to hear our prayers; rather than to those to whom we have no command to pray, and with regard to whom it is doubtful whether they can hear our prayers or not.

We have thus given some reasons for thinking that it is *needless* for any one who believes the doctrine of our Lord's incarnation to seek for any other intercessor. We hope in our next number to show that the directing our prayers to others is worse than merely useless, that it is productive of mischievous practical consequences.

#### THE CURÉ AND THE BISHOP.

(Abridged from the French.)

IN a retired village in France there lived, not long ago, a good curé, in the midst of two or three hundred parishioners. One Sunday, when returning from saying the mass, he was reflecting upon the little benefit his people could have derived from it, he came upon a dozen of them, who were chatting together before the door of the church. It occurred to him that a familiar conversation with these simple country people might be more useful to them than chanting vespers to them in Latin; so he stopped in the midst of them, seated himself on a stone, and leaning his two hands on the top of his walkingstick, he said, in a good-humoured tone—

“Tell me, John, are you a Christian?”

*tanquam heretici arceantur, et gravius puniendi per diocesanos locorum, seu officiales eorum, aut inquisitores hereticæ pravitatis, in regnis seu provinciis, in quibus contra hoc decretum, aliquid fuerit formæ attentatum aut præsumptum, juxta canonice et legitime sanctiones, in favorem Catholicæ fidei, contra hereticos et eorum fautores, salubriter ad-inventas.*—Labb. et Coss. vol. xii. p. 99, &c., Par. 1672.